



**New Jersey Department of Health
Governor's Council for Medical Research and Treatment of Autism
Meeting Minutes – May 20, 2013 (ratified)**

Council Members Present

Elizabeth K. Bell, BS, volunteer and independent contractor with Autism Speaks,
Autism Organization Representative

Caroline Eggerding, M.D., Healthcare Organization Representative and Chairperson of the
Governor's Council for Medical Research and Treatment of Autism

Susan P. Evans, Ed.D., Education Program Specialist for Early Intervention Program,
Commissioner of Health and Senior Services Appointee

Matthew Cortland, BA, Instructor, Teach for America, Public Member

Ketan Kansagra, M.D., FAAP, Children's Hospital of New Jersey at Newark Beth Israel Medical
Center, Academic Institution Representative

Absent

B. Madeleine Goldfarb, MA, Founder/Director of the Noah's Ark Children's Association,
Autism Organization Representative

Gary Weitzen, BA, Executive Director, Parents of Autistic Children (POAC) Autism Services,
Organization Representative

Judah Zeigler, Senate President Appointee

NJ Department of Health (DOH) Attendees

Martin T. Zanna M.D., MPH
Acting Executive Director
Governor's Council for Medical Research and Treatment of Autism

Linda N. Bocclair, M.Ed., MBA
Executive Assistant
Governor's Council for Medical Research and Treatment of Autism

Mary Ray, Contract Administrator 2
Governor's Council for Medical Research and Treatment of Autism
Commission on Brain Injury Research
Commission on Spinal Cord Research

Dr. Robinson, Ph.D., Consultant
Scientific Planning Consulting

Public Attendees

Audrey Mars, M.D., Hunterdon Medical Center, Regional Autism Center

Gerard Costa, Ph.D., Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health at Montclair State University and Principal Investigator, NJ ACE Coordinating Center

Kathleen Freeman

I. Welcome - Council Chairperson, Dr. Caroline Eggerding called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM and welcomed everyone.

II. Public Meetings Act Announcement- Dr. Eggerding read the Public Meetings Act, followed by roll call.

III. Approval of the March 4, 2013 Council Meeting Minutes

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to approve the minutes. MOTION by Ms. Bell to approve the minutes was seconded by Dr. Evans.

MOTION to approve the minutes was passed with four in favor and one abstention.

IV. Report of the Acting Executive Director, Martin T. Zanna, M.D. MPH

Council Membership

Appointments to the Council are a high priority for the Governor's office with five or more appointments anticipated to be made within the next couple of months; three academic institution representatives, one public member with a family member with autism and one autism organization representative.

Report on RFA and Timeline

During the past two months Council staff has processed 24 grant applications. The first step was the relevance review to ensure that each application conformed to the requirements as outlined in the grant guidelines. Subsequently, Mary Ray reviewed the applications for compliance with applicable NJ State statutes and regulations, and to ensure completeness and accuracy. This was a very time consuming process with Mary contacting applicants with issues that needed to be addressed before reviewers could gain access to the applications through SAGE.

Recruitment of 30 reviewers was especially challenging within a short timeframe. The Council's staff worked with Dr. Robinson in identifying and communicating with reviewers with expertise in specific areas of autism clinical research to ensure the best matches for the specific applications. The meetings of the Scientific Merit Review Panels were held via teleconferences on April 29 and 30, 2013. The results of the meetings are reflected on the leaderboards.

As discussed during the last Council meeting there is a continued need to build capacity for autism clinical research in New Jersey, given the yield of funded projects despite multiple funding cycles. Accordingly, Council staff is discussing measures with Dr. Gerald Costa to expand the C.C.'s capacity to support new pilot projects now included within the NJ ACE. The Coordinating Center is anticipated to play a larger role in assisting program sites and pilot projects that require or request consultation (particularly with respect to furthering their methodology/experimental design) as a condition for funding in the current RFA cycle.

The Council staff has also outreached representatives of clinical translational research centers who share their "best practices" in working with projects to strengthen proposals that have potential for direct clinical impact with high significance to move them forward. This type of support would apply to projects with Impact Scores "reflecting strong with either numerous minor weaknesses or strong with at least one moderate weakness" and aligned with NIH's rating schema (recently clarified March 25, 2013). This approach will facilitate Council's commitment to building capacity for autism clinical research and the resources available to us to support grantees.

Energetic discussion among Council members is encouraged relative to approaching this meeting's major charge, e.g. making funding decisions in response to the robust response to RFA released December 10, 2012. Unlike other RFA cycles, this cycle included pilot as well as program site applicants.

Report on NJ ACE Grantees

Progress reports from the NJ ACE Coordinating Center and Rutgers University Principal Investigators were sent to Council in preparation for voting for continuation funding. Continuation funding is recommended for both Montclair State University and Rutgers University.

Status of FY 14 Research Funding Ad hoc Committee

The current RFA process and funding decisions will inform the work of the ad hoc committee and can be included in decisions for funding in FY 14. We anticipate that the ad hoc Committee will reconvene shortly with recommendations due to Council at the Sept. 9, 2013 meeting. An RFA reflecting those categories of grants to fund, as determined by Council, will be posted in December 2013 for funding by June 2014.

March 2012 Proceedings of the Meeting of Clinical and Basic Science Researchers

Excerpts from the group discussions are being reviewed. We anticipate that the final document will be completed and distributed prior to the September Council meeting.

National Autism Awareness Month

April was National Autism Awareness Month. Drs. Evans and Kansagra coordinated an event at the Children's Hospital of New Jersey at Newark Beth Israel Medical Center with Dr. Arturo Brito, Deputy Commissioner, NJ Dept. of Health as the keynote speaker. Dr. Brito's Grand Rounds presentation on autism focusing on an update on implications and changes due to the implementation of DSM-5 on clinical practices was well received by physicians, nurses and other health professionals.

Ms. Bell brought to our attention the special breakfast held by the Governor for the New Jersey autism community and was pleased to hear that the Council was represented at the event. Dr. Eggerding attended as the Council representative and reported the breakfast is an annual event and was well received by all in attendance including family groups, advocacy groups and volunteers and those involved in diagnosis and treatment of autism. The Governor spoke briefly conveying his interest in and commitment in terms of not only providing support and services for all individuals with autism but trying to do so in a way that is fair and just. A Q&A session followed with questions ranging from adult based services to residents and funding. Dr. Eggerding is pleased that autism continues to be a focus of the Governor and First Lady Mary Pat Christie.

Dr. Evans suggested that Council consider plans for the April 2014 autism awareness month.

V. 2014 Meeting Calendar

Council members were asked to review the proposed calendar for the 2014 Council meetings and comment on possible conflicts between the dates and local and/or national autism meetings. There were no conflicts identified. Council will vote to approve, at their September 9, 2013 meeting, the following meeting dates: March 3, 2014; June 2, 2014; September 8, 2014 and December 1, 2014. All meetings are held on Mondays from 6-9PM in the NJ Department of Health, Health and Agriculture building, 369 South Warren Street, Trenton, NJ 08625-0360.

VI. NJ ACE Progress Reports & Voting for Continuation Funding

The first year Progress Reports from Dr. Gerald Costa (PI) for Montclair State University (NJ ACE Coordinating Center) and Dr. Linda Brzustowicz (PI) for Rutgers University (NJ ACE Program Site) were sent to Council in preparation for voting for continuation funding. Continuation funding for year two was recommended by Dr. Zanna for Montclair State University and by Drs. Costa and Zanna for Rutgers University.

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to approve the Progress Report from Dr. Costa for the Coordinating Center and continuation funding.

MOTION by Dr. Evans to approve the Progress report from Dr. Costa for the Coordinating Center and continuation funding was seconded by Ms. Bell.

A brief discussion followed with Dr. Eggerding commenting on the busy schedule anticipated for Dr. Costa and his team as a result of the addition of pilot projects. Dr. Costa is consulting with Council staff on the expansion of the NJ ACE Coordinating Center and is ready and eager to move forward. His team is ready and he anticipates that the Program Coordinator will be hired by July 1, 2013.

Ms. Bell asked if there is anything that Council can do to assist Dr. Costa. Dr. Costa stated that the major discussion will focus on submitting a revised plan for additional resources to manage the number of pilot projects that will be approved by Council. Dr. Costa is having preliminary discussions with his team about the infrastructure needed to match the additional responsibilities. Dr. Costa commented that the Coordinating Center team communicates frequently with Council's staff. As a result he feels that a productive working relationship has been established.

The question was asked if there will be a modification of the Coordinating Center budget given the postponement of some activities resulting from the delay in funding the full complement of Program Sites. The response was there will be a budget modification considering unexpended funds from year one and additional funding to manage the pilot projects.

MOTION to approve the Progress Report from Dr. Costa for the Coordinating Center and continuation funding was passed with all in favor.

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to approve the Progress Report from Dr. Brzustowicz for Rutgers University and continuation funding.

MOTION by Ms. Bell to approve the Progress report from Rutgers University and continuation funding was seconded by Dr. Evans.

Dr. Eggerding commented that it appears that Rutgers has made good progress in the past year. Council asked questions about the research as related to the new DSM5 criteria and how current patients would be affected. Additionally, there was interest as to whether the 25 new families would be evaluated using the DSM4 or DSM5 criteria. It was learned that Rutgers's plan is to focus on DSM4 and at the same time determine whether the patients would be diagnosed differently by application of a cross-walk to DSM5 criteria for comparison purposes.

MOTION to approve the Progress Report from Rutgers University and continuation funding was passed with all in favor.

VII. NJ ACE Grant Applications-discussion and voting

Dr. Eggerding thanked the team for an almost “superhuman” effort in terms of the turnaround time, the number of applications, recruiting and coordinating review panels as well as the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) presentations and providing all of the information to Council in time for review prior to the meeting.

Dr. Eggerding referred to the Conflict of Interest declaration and asked members to complete the forms and return them to Mary Ray. Members were asked to leave the room when specific grants that they have listed on the forms are discussed to avoid any perceived conflict of interest.

Dr. Eggerding reviewed processes for deriving funding recommendations from the Scientific Merit Review Panel and the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC). In the previous two RFA cycles the recommendations were to use the NIH 9 point scale with impact scores of “3” and below for funding.

However, after two grant cycles the Council had only funded the Coordinating Center and two Program Sites and decided to prioritize applicants who had submitted more clinically based research and translational based research. So with the help of Council staff in introducing a recalibration of the process, both the review panel and the SAC were able to provide valuable information for use in the recommending/funding of promising applications. The reach would now include strong proposals with either numerous minor weaknesses or with at least one moderate weakness (equates to a range of good or 4-5) taking into account the help of the Coordinating Center in moving these projects forward. It is important to understand the rationale for the changes as we move forward to discuss the applications.

Dr. Eggerding asked if there were any questions relating to the recommended fundable range for grants in the current grant cycle. Dr. Robinson commented in response to a member’s question, that the primary motivating factor was Council’s desire to build capacity for autism research in New Jersey which is the fundamental reason for funding the Coordinating Center. Pilot Projects have been added to this grant cycle and they will need support. The reviewers were provided the above information. They also were made aware that the Coordinating Center’s role would be expanded to offer more support.

Dr. Zanna commented on the new scoring guidance released in late March 2013 by NIH that had been evolving for some time addressing the grant review policies and processes. NIH is encouraging reviewers not to be so focused on just certain criteria but to consider “overall impact.” Further, Dr. Zanna indicated through inquiry of Clinical Translational Research Centers he learned such centers often engage with applicants to address issues that can be rectified, thus allowing them to be optimally developed and move forward....the type of help the Coordinating Center may be able to provide.

Dr. Robinson commented that at NIH they are encouraging reviewers to focus on the entire application and reiterated NIH’s guidance to consider its overall impact. Even so, she relayed

that even good applications are not always being funded. Also, in response to a member's question alluding to such assistance given to a program site application, Dr. Zanna commented while both program sites and pilot projects are fundamentally different--on different trajectories initially---a successful pilot after two years of robust funding potentially may develop to the extent that the pilot site may consider in a subsequent funding cycle an application to become a program site—at which point the coordinating center would be able to offer the level of support needed when appropriate.

A member commented that a very positive outcome resulting from the addition of the pilot projects in the current grant cycle is that many new researchers submitted applications and several may be funded. Another member commented that she is agreeable with the change in that the SAC and the Council staff appear comfortable with the approach. Dr. Robinson commented that in general she was impressed during the meetings with the capability of the reviewers as displayed in their discussions and that the panelists generally concurred despite the fact that there were a variety of research topics. Because many of the applications were collaborative in nature it was frequently necessary to select reviewers with varying expertise to optimize review.

NJ ACE Program Site Applications

Dr. Eggerding commented that the Council will discuss each of the Program Site applications first and then the Pilot Site applications. The first Program Site was recommended for approval by the SAC and the Scientific Merit Review Panel. The remainder of the Program Site applications was not recommended for approval.

CAUT13APS025-Program Site

Dr. Eggerding asked for a motion. As previously discussed Council can vote to accept and then amend the motion to accept with conditions. The first application, CAUT13APS025, was recommended for approval.

Dr. Evans moved to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to approve CAUT13APS025 and seconded by Mr. Cortland.

Dr. Eggerding stated that an amendment could be made to the original motion if the Council decides to approve the application.

The original motion was amended to approve CAUT13APS025 with the condition that there is significant progress toward AIM 1 by the end of year one for consideration for funding in year two.

MOTION to approve CAUT13APS025 with the condition that there is significant progress toward AIM 1 by the end of year one for consideration for funding in year two was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APS030-Program Site

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS030.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS030 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APS022-Program Site

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS022.

Discussion: One member was disappointed that this application did not score in a fundable range considering the importance of the research topic.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS022 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APS019-Program Site

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Kansagra moved and seconded by Dr. Evans to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS019.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS019 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APS031-Program Site

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Mr. Cortland to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS031.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APS031 was passed with all in favor.

NJ ACE Pilot Project Applications

Dr. Eggerding commented that six pilot projects were recommended for approval and thirteen pilot projects were not been recommended for approval.

CAUT13APL010-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Kansagra moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL010.

Discussion: Members commented that the application was well written and is a very exciting research project.

MOTION to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL010 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL015-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding commented that she will recuse herself from discussion and voting given that her organization is associated with the applicant's organization and she has a research grant with one of the investigators on the application. Dr. Eggerding left the room during discussion and voting.

Dr. Evans called for a motion.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL015.

Discussion: A member asked if this application should be funded as is or with a condition relating to the selection of treatment options. She asked if the SAC commented and Dr. Zanna responded that the SAC did not weigh in on that level of detail. Dr. Robinson commented that the reviewers did not discuss this as a major issue. Overall this was considered to be a very strong application. One member commented that this applicant represents a new researcher for Council funding and one with a very relevant research project.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL015 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL003-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL003.

Discussion: One member expressed concern over this application questioning if the information resulting from the research isn't already available and if this project is within the scope of the Council. The applicant did address one of the IACC objectives approved by the Council. While working with the adult population is a positive feature of the application, there are many questions and serious issues about the methodology. The reviewers commented during their meeting that this is a very important project and they liked the way the project was structured with the four step approach.

A question was asked if the reviewers were applied researchers themselves and what fields they represented. Dr. Robinson commented that one reviewer was in the field of transportation research, a second with expertise in clinical services, interventions and there were reviewers with expertise in meta-analysis of studies.

One member commented that the Adults with Autism Task Force in the Department of Human Services identified transportation as a concern and a daily issue for adults with autism and their families.

A member asked if there is anyone who can help sort out the methodological areas requiring further development. Dr. Costa, the Principal Investigator for the NJ ACE Coordinating Center grant was attending the meeting as a public member and asked for permission to address the question. Dr. Costa stated that while he is not involved in the pre-award process it is his understanding that when Council awards grants the Coordinating Center staff can be provided with the detailed reviews and then customize the kind of support the grantee will need from the Coordinating Center. Dr. Costa will then have a basis for making recommendations about the resources needed by the Coordinating Center to support the grantees. Dr. Zanna commented that Dr. Costa would need the information to do his job.

If Council were to approve the application for funding the methodological concerns would have to be addressed by the applicant. A member commented that she sees outcomes related to education but not to policy, as stated in the application. The emphasis needs to be for those who would benefit from travel training; somehow identify a group that is held back because they haven't learned how to use public transportation. A member commented that beyond the intrinsic qualities that could impact a group, this study could provide insight about the transportation system such as (1) if the drivers are educated about the passengers, (2) if individuals with ASD "freak out" when they see a particular bus driver or (3) any other number of issues that could be addressed within the transportation infrastructure. This study not only surveys the adults affected with autism but also their guardians or caretakers.

Having been tabled as a consequence of moving the agenda along Dr. Eggerding re-introduced this application and briefly summarized the previous discussion and reminded the Council that

the original motion can be amended if the Council decides to approve this application with conditions.

MOTION to amend the original motion with the condition that the applicant clarify the methodology to the satisfaction of the reviewers with a revised methodology that addresses the concerns as stated in the reviewers' critiques was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL016-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL016.

Discussion: Dr. Zanna commented that the SAC had concerns that there needs to be a properly matched control group for this research project. Members commented that a properly matched control group will ensure an unbiased study. While the project will not establish a causal link, if the results are positive there is a concern about the interpretation of the results. It will be important to objectively report the results of this project. It was not clear how the diagnosis of autism was confirmed for those participating in the study. Also there was a question about data sharing and if a requirement is to participate in NDAR. The response was that the pilot projects are not required to submit data to NDAR although they are encouraged to do so, if applicable to their projects.

MOTION to amend the original motion to (1) address the reviewers' concerns about properly matched control groups, (2) characterization of the diagnosis of the autism group through established methodology such as ADOS (3) and encourage sharing data through NDAR if the research design is compatible with the collection of data necessary for inclusion in NDAR was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL018-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Kansagra moved and seconded by Dr. Evans to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL018.

Discussion: A member commented that this is a very significant research project, looking for better ways to characterize autism.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL018 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL014-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel to fund CAUT13APL014.

Discussion: Dr. Zanna commented that a member of the SAC stated that this is a very solid proposal. Making sure that the quality of the data in the birth certificate in the patient discharge database is occurring is an important consideration.

A member commented that while this proposal is well designed the question is if it is important and would provide any relevant information. In response a member commented that if the aim is to identify neonatal and obstetric risk factors, the results would be important and innovative in the method used to characterize changes over a time period.

The Council staff added that overall this is a solid study. However, it remains to be determined if they'll get enough detail about the perinatal period from the database. Also because the project involves secondary data analysis a comment was made that the cost could be reduced. The question was asked if there was a way to confirm that the applicant could define specifically the data available from the database.

MOTION to amend the original motion with the condition of demonstrating that the data is available and detailed enough to the satisfaction of the reviewers was passed with all in favor.

Dr. Eggerding commented that the remaining applications were not recommended for funding by the Scientific Merit Review Panel. Council will vote on each of the applications.

CAUT13APL026-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to approve the recommendations of the Review Panel not to fund.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL026.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL026 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL005-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to approve the recommendation not to fund.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL005.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL005 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL004-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to accept the recommendation not to fund.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL004.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL004 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL017-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to accept the recommendation not to fund.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL017.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL017 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL012-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Kansagera moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL012.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL012 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL031-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to accept the recommendation not to fund.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Evans to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL031.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL031 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL029-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to accept the recommendation.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL029.

Discussion: This is a great topic. This is an applicant who we should talk to help later on.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL029 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL011-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Kansagra moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL011.

No discussion:

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL011 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL023-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Evans to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL023.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL023 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL019-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Ms. Bell to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL019.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL019 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL025-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL025.

No discussion.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL025 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL002-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Ms. Bell moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL002.

No discussion:

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL002 was passed with all in favor.

CAUT13APL027-Pilot Project

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion.

Dr. Evans moved and seconded by Dr. Kansagra to accept the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL027.

Discussion: Council is seeing good topics from researchers who repeatedly apply for grants yet do not qualify. A member would like to see a mechanism to support some of the researchers to be successful in obtaining grants.

MOTION to approve the recommendation of the Scientific Merit Review Panel not to fund CAUT13APL027 was passed with all in favor.

VIII. Report of Revenue and Expenditures

Ms. Ray presented the Revenue and Expenditures Report (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012). There were no comments or questions.

IX. Adjournment

Dr. Eggerding called for a motion to adjourn. MOTION by Dr. Evans to adjourn was seconded by Ms. Goldfarb.

MOTION passed with all in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.